DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 200 TM 032 310

AUTHOR Maddahian, Ebrahim
TITLE Comparative Analyses of Students' Academic Achievement in Ten Schools Program and Selected Comparison Schools. Publication No. 785.
INSTITUTION Los Angeles Unified School District, CA. Program Evaluation and Research Branch.
PUB DATE 2000-11-00
NOTE 33p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Black Students; Comparative Analysis; *Disadvantaged Youth; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Hispanic American Students; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Reading Instruction; Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS *Los Angeles Unified School District CA; *Ten Schools Program CA

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this evaluation was to compare the achievement of the Ten Schools Program (TSP) students with the achievement of students in comparable schools. Since the original 10 schools selected for the TSP evaluation in 1988 were no longer a proper comparison group, evaluators selected a new set of 12 comparison schools. The mission of the TSP is to provide an instructional program and an organizational design that is language instruction intensive to reverse the pattern of poor academic achievement of African American and other students in schools with predominantly minority populations. Analyses using 1997-1998 and 1998-1999 data support the sampling decision that the TSP schools and newly selected comparison schools serve the same population. Analyses indicate that TSP students outperformed comparison students in reading, mathematics, and language at a $p<0.001$ level of significance. The effect size for the TSP program exceeds the corresponding comparison schools' effect size in all three areas, especially in mathematics and language. After adjusting for pre-existing differences between TSP schools and comparison schools, there are still statistically significant differences in each subject area tested. These differences are especially meaningful for mathematics and language achievement tests. An appendix contains a reference guide to the TSP program. (Contains 19 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

TM

COMPARATIVE ANALYSES OF STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN TEN SCHOOLS PROGRAM AND SELECTED COMPARISON SCHOOLS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Maddahian

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 449 200

Publication No. 785

This report was prepared by

Ebrahim Maddahian, PhD

Program Evaluation and Research Branch

Los Angeles Unified School District

TM032310

November 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMPARATIVE ANALYSES OF STUDENTS' ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN TEN SCHOOLS PROGRAM AND SELECTED COMPARISON SCHOOLS

Publication No. 785

This report was prepared by
Ebrahim Maddahian, PhD

Program Evaluation and Research Branch
Los Angeles Unified School District

November 2000

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Roy Romer

Superintendent of Schools

APPROVED:

Ted Bartell, Director
Program Evaluation and Research Branch
Los Angeles Unified School District
November 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Approval Page ii

Table of Contents iii

List of Tables iv

Executive Summary v

Introduction 1

Research Questions 3

Methods 3

Results 4

Conclusions 11

List of the Previous Evaluations of the Ten Schools Program 12

References:..... 14

Appendix A (Reference Guide No. 10) 15

LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. Schools Included in the Ten Schools Program and Their Corresponding Comparison Schools 2

2. Reading, Mathematics and Language Mean NCE **Stanford 9** Test Scores for the Ten Schools Program, Comparison Schools, District Elementary Students (All) and District Elementary Black and Hispanic Students 5

3. Reading, Mathematics and Language Mean NCE **Aprenda** Test Scores for the Ten Schools Program, Comparison Schools, District Elementary Students (All) and District Elementary Hispanic Students 6

4. Percent of Limited English Proficient Students, Title 1 Students and Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch in Ten Schools Program and Comparison Schools 7

5. Comparing Students' Gain in the Ten Schools Program to Students' Gain in Comparison Schools 8

6. Summaries of Analysis of Covariance for Reading, Mathematics, and Language NCE Test Scores Comparing Ten Schools Program with Comparison Schools Controlling Preexisting Differences 10

Executive Summary

Evaluation Objective

The main objective of this evaluation was to compare the achievement of the Ten Schools Program (TSP) students[1] with the achievement of students in comparable schools. Since the original 10 comparison schools selected for the evaluation of the Ten Schools Program in 1988 were no longer a proper comparison group, the Program Evaluation and Research Branch (PERB) selected a new set of 12 comparison schools based on a number of criteria including student academic achievement level, school's ethnic mix, and school's geographical location.

Evaluation Questions

This evaluation attempts to answer the following evaluation questions:

1. Do the newly selected comparison schools and schools included in TSP derive from the same population? In other words, do the newly selected comparison schools match the TSP schools based on their students' academic achievement and other historically significant factors that impact students' academic achievement?
2. Is there a significant difference between the TSP students' level of achievement gain and the achievement gain of students in the selected comparison schools?

Results

1. Analyses using 1997-98 and 1998-99 data support our sampling decision that the TSP schools and newly selected comparison schools belong to the same population.
2. Based on the results of our analyses TSP students outperformed comparison schools students in the areas of reading, math and language at $p<0.001$ level of significance. The effect size for the TSP program exceeds the corresponding comparison schools' effect size in all three areas, but especially in math and language.

---

[1] Actually 12 schools since 2 more schools were added to the list of Schools in TSP in 1998.

3. After adjusting for the pre-existing differences between TSP schools and comparison schools, there still are statistically significant differences in each subject area tested. TSP students outperform students in comparison schools in all three areas tested.

Conclusions

The schools selected for comparison in 1998-99 and the Ten Schools program are drawn from the same population. They were comparable in 1997-98 and 1998-99 not only in terms of their level of achievement but also on some crucial background variables such as percent of Title 1 participants, percent of students receiving free/reduced lunch, and percent of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

The TSP schools students outperformed the comparison schools in the areas of reading, mathematics, and language. These differences are statistically significant, and educationally meaningful especially for mathematics and language achievement tests.

Comparative Analyses of Students Academic Achievement in Ten Schools Program and Selected Comparison Schools

Introduction

The Ten Schools Program (TSP) is a research-based instructional and organizational program, initiated by the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) in 1987 to improve the students' academic achievement in 10 low-achieving urban schools with a predominant African American student population (Appendix A- Reference Guide No. 10, 1996-97). However, during recent years the TSP population has changed and is currently over 50% Hispanic.

The Office of Student Integration Services of the LAUSD contracted the Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI) for an evaluation of the TSP in conjunction with the Program Evaluation and Research Branch of the LAUSD. The main objectives of this part of evaluation were to: 1) compare the achievement of the TSP students with the achievement of students in comparable schools, and 2) identify the instructional components of the TSP schools that impact the TSP students' outcomes. This report deals only with the first evaluation question by comparing the level of students' academic achievement in the TSP schools to those of the comparison schools.

The original evaluation design of the Ten Schools Program (TSP) required selection of a set of 10 matched comparison schools. The subsequent evaluations indicated that while the Ten Schools Program schools were improving year after year, the "Comparison Schools" students' outcomes were actually declining to the point that they were no longer a proper comparison group for the TSP program evaluation (Maddahian, 1999; Maddahian, Pike, and Weisbender, 1996). This judgment led to the selection of a new set of 12 schools to match the original 10 schools and two more additional schools in the Ten School Program. Program Evaluation and Research Branch (PERB) staff selected this new set of comparison schools based on a number of criteria including student academic achievement level, school's ethnic mix, and geographical location. Table 1 presents a list of the schools included in the TSP, corresponding matched schools, their Academic Performance Index (API) in 1999, percent of the school population who are Black, and percent of the school population who are Hispanic.

Table 1

Schools Included in the Ten Schools Program and Their Corresponding Comparison Schools

Ten School Program				Comparison School			
School	API*	% Black	% His**	School	API	%Black	% His
Bright	605	40	59	Chapman	607	25	50
King	555	43	57	Wilshire Crest	563	45	42
93rd Street	506	32	67	Amestoy	483	31	57
Compton	482	42	58	153rd Street	477	45	43
Flournoy	464	48	52	Saturn	464	34	64
Barrett	460	50	50	Angeles Mesa	453	65	35
Joyner	444	52	48	West Athens	446	34	64
McKinley	442	26	73	68th Street	444	25	74
96th Street	440	34	66	122nd Street	424	34	64
112th Street	424	34	64	109th Street	415	34	65
116th Street	420	50	49	99th Street	415	48	52
118th Street	356	40	59	Grape	355	37	63

* API: 1999 Academic Performance Index % Black: Percent of school population who are Black.

** % His: Percent of school population who are Hispanic.

Research Questions

This evaluation attempts to answer the following evaluation questions:

1. Do the newly selected comparison schools and schools included in TSP derive from the same population? In other words, do the newly selected comparison schools match the TSP schools based on their students' academic achievement and other historically significant factors that impact students' academic achievement such as students' socioeconomic status or their level of language proficiency?
2. Is there a significant difference between the TSP students' level of achievement gain and the achievement gain of students in the selected comparison schools?

Methodology

A longitudinal and cross-sectional design was utilized, using three years of students' academic outcomes as measured by two norm-referenced standardized tests: Stanford 9 and Aprenda. Reading, mathematics, and language Normal Curve Equivalent[2] (NCE) test scores common to all grades were selected to compare students' academic achievement. NCE scores have a normal distribution, and an equal-interval scale ranging from 1 to 99.

T-test analyses were utilized to compare the TSP students' achievement outcomes as measured by Stanford-9 and Aprenda to the students' achievement level in comparison schools. The acceptable level of significance was adjusted to reflect the number of analyses performed. A decision was made to accept the alternative hypothesis (that there is a difference) at 0.01. This means that there is a true difference between the two group of schools if the probability of that event happening by chance is less than one percent. Since our sample for these analyses are very large (more than 10,000), in addition to a statistical significance test we also examined the effect size when there is a significant difference. The district's average gain for elementary schools for year 1999-2000 was about 2 NCE points, roughly equal to 0.1 effect size (1999 to 2000 Stanford 9 Matched Gains by District, School, and Grade Level, October 2000, Program Evaluation and Research Branch).

---

[2] An *NCE score is a normalized standard score with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 21.06 (Technical Data Report Stanford Achievement Test Series Ninth Edition).*

Results

First Evaluation Question

To answer the first evaluation question: "*Do the newly selected comparison schools and schools included in TSP derive from the same population?*" we compared the two groups of schools based on their achievement and other important background data collected at two points of time (Spring 1998 and Spring 1999). Tables 2 and 3 present the results of these analyses based on students' achievement outcomes as measured by Stanford 9 and Aprenda achievement tests batteries. Table 4 presents the results of analyses comparing the TSP student population with the population of the comparison schools on specific background variables such as students' level of English language proficiency and students' socioeconomic status.

Data presented in Table 2 support the hypothesis that newly selected comparison schools were drawn from the same population as TSP schools in terms of students' previous level of academic achievement as measured by the Stanford 9 battery of tests. There was only one statistically significant difference in favor of comparison schools between the two groups: the comparison schools had a higher mean for reading in 1997-98 (32.2 vs. 33.8) compared to TSP. The effect-size value for this comparison is close to 0.10, the District's 1999-2000 effect size for elementary schools.

Table 2

Reading, Mathematics, and Language Mean NCE **Stanford 9** Test Scores for the Ten Schools Program, Comparison Schools, District Elementary Students (All) and District Elementary Black and Hispanic Students

Group	1997-98			1998-99		
	N	Mean	T-Value	N	Mean	T-Value
Total Reading						
TSP	4,936	32.2	4.34**	8201	35.8	2.06
Comp	5,352	33.8		7252	35.2	
D - (All)+	202,522	36.5		263627	37.1	
D - (B & H)++	156,934	32.2		216699	33.6	
Total Mathematics						
TSP	5,356	35.8	0.54	8402	39.7	1.09
Comp	5,632	35.6		7526	39.4	
D - (All)	216,968	39.3		274066	41.6	
D - (B & H)	170,125	35.4		226280	38.2	
Total Language						
TSP	5,109	35.2	1.70	6875	37.3	0.17
Comp	5,561	35.8		7326	37.4	
D - (All)	210,448	38.9		268419	39.4	
D - (B & H)	164,128	34.9		222476	36.1	

** P<0.01 T-Value means T-test value.

+ D - (All) means district all elementary students.

++ D - (B & H) means district Black and Hispanic students only.

Analyses presented in Table 3 using Aprenda test scores also support the notion that the selected comparison schools are drawn from the same population as TSP schools. No significant difference was found between the two groups of schools for reading, mathematics and language Aprenda test scores.

Table 3

Reading, Mathematics, and Language Mean NCE **Aprenda** Test Scores for the Ten Schools Program, Comparison Schools, District Elementary Students (All) and District Elementary Hispanic Students

Group	1997-98			1998-99		
	N	Mean	T-Value	N	Mean	T-Value
Total Reading						
TSP	2,603	48.0	0.15	57	53.0	0.05
Comp	2,470	48.0		256	52.9	
District	99,965	47.2		4,646	49 4	
Total Mathematics						
TSP	2,802	43.9	0.72	62	51.2	1.10
Comp	2,569	43.6		258	53.9	
District	105,965	41.5		5,190	44.6	
Total Language						
TSP	2,368	46.1	0.64	48	49.2	1.67
Comp	2,488	45.8		255	54.1	
District	103,677	44.1		4,966	46.2	

T-Value means T-test value.

To examine the notion of whether the selected comparison schools were different from the TSP schools in some of the historically significant factors that impact students'

academic achievement such as students' socioeconomic status or their level of language proficiency, a set of cross-tab analyses were performed. Factors included in these analyses were indicators of English language proficiency (being a limited English student), and student's socioeconomic status (being a Title I student or a student receiving free/reduced lunch).

Table 4 presents the results of these analyses for two points in time (October 1997-98 and October 1998-99). Although there are changes from year to year, these changes do not indicate any systematically different demographic pattern between the TSP schools and comparison schools within each year.

Table 4

Percent of Limited English Proficient Students, Title I Students and Students Receiving Free/Reduced Lunch in Ten Schools Program and Comparison Schoo

Factor	TSP Schools		Comparison Schools	
	1997-98 %	1998-99 %	1997-98 %	1998-99 %
LEP Students	29.5	41.4	27.4	45.6
Title I	86.9	75.3	81.7	60.7
Free/Reduced Meal	89.0	78.4	78.2	85.5

Second Evaluation Question

To examine the second evaluation question: "Does *a significant difference exist between the TSP schools students' achievement gain and the achievement gain of students from selected comparison schools?"* analyses were performed based on a matched set of data. That means we selected only students who have been in their school for two consecutive years and were tested in both years. Two separate sets of analyses were performed for this question: T-test and Analysis of Covariance.

T-test Results

The results of the t-test are based on the following steps:

1. Only students who have two consecutive points of data (Spring 1999 and Spring 2000) were selected.
2. Reading, mathematics, and language gain scores were calculated by subtracting student's 1999 Stanford-9 NCE test scores from 2000.
3. T-tests were performed using gain-scores as the dependent variable to compare the gain differences between the TSP schools and comparison schools.

Based on the data presented in Table 5, TSP students outperformed comparison schools' students in the areas of reading, math and language at $p<0.001$ level of significance. The effect-size for the TSP program exceeds the comparison schools effect size in all three areas, but especially in mathematics and language.

Table 5

Comparing Students' Gain in the Ten Schools Program to Comparison Schools

Group	N	Mean-1999	Mean-2000	Gain	T-value	E-Value
Total Reading						
TSP Schools	5,275	37.1	38.9	1.8	3.95***	0.10
Comparison Schools	4,345	36.9	37.7	0.8		
Total Mathematics						
TSP Schools	5,484	41.3	44.6	3.3	7.67***	0.17
Comparison Schools	4,684	41.6	42.4	0.8		
Total Language						
TSP Schools	4,341	38.2	42.2	4.0	4.44***	0.21
Comparison Schools	4,460	38.8	41.4	2.6		

*** P<0.001
E-Value: Effect Size Value

Analysis of Covariance Results

In these analyses we utilized the 1999 test data as a covariate, controlling for any pre-existing differences between the two groups. Analysis of Covariance is a delicate technique for intact groups when there is no true random sampling. This technique compares the adjusted means of the groups controlling for pre-exiting difference among the groups included in the analysis. Table 6 presents the results of these analyses for reading, mathematics and language test scores, respectively. Based on these analyses we can conclude that:

1. Pretest data are reliable predictors of the posttest data for this sample. Adjusting for preexisting individual differences not only accounts for a student's previous ability in reading, mathematics, and language but also adjusts for his/her previous home and school experiences and to some extent for his/her background. A student achievement level at each moment is a function of his/her background, and previous interactions and experiences with the school as a whole.
2. After adjusting for the pre-exiting individual differences, there still are statistically significant differences between the gains of TSP students and their counterparts in each subject area tested.

Table 6

Summary of the Analyses of Covariance for Reading, Mathematics, and Language NCE Test Scores

Source of	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F-Value
Total Reading				
Covariate	1,673,633.4	1	1,673,633.4	12,566.4***
Group	2,598.4	1	2,598.4	19.5***
Error	1,280,822.6	9,617	133.2	
Total Mathematics				
Covariate	1,898,018.0	1	1,898,018.0	8,815.7***
Group	13,559.5	1	13,559.5	63.0***
Error	2,188,517.3	10,168	215.3	
Total Language				
Covariate	1,560,388.5	1	1,560,388.5	7,619.3***
Group	3,558.3	1	3,558.3	17.8***
Error	1,801,777.7	8,168	204.8	

*** P<0.001

Conclusions

Based on the data presented in the previous section of this report it can be concluded that:

1. The schools selected for comparison in 1998-99 and the Ten Schools program are drawn from the same population. They were comparable in 1997-98 and 1998-99 not only in terms of their level of achievement but also on some important background variables such as percent of the Title 1 recipients, percent of students receiving free/reduced lunch, and percent of students who are Limited English Proficient (LEP).
2. The TSP schools students outperformed the comparison schools in the three areas of reading, mathematics, and language for the year 1999-2000. These differences are significant and meaningful especially for mathematics and language achievement tests.

List of Previous Evaluations of the Ten Schools Program

Maddahian, E., 1999, A Comparative Study of Student Achievement as Measured by Stanford 9 and Aprenda Norm-Referenced Achievement Tests, Publication No. 769, Program Evaluation and Research Branch, Los Angeles Unified School District

Maddahian, E., Pike, D., Weisbender, Leo; 1996, Academic Achievement in the Ten Schools Program: A Success Story of Educational Innovation in LAUSD, 1987-95, Publication No. 642, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Alkin, Marvin C., Doby, Winston, & Lindheim, Elaine, 1992, Report on LAUSD Integration Programs: Special Studies Across Programs, 1990-91 Publication No. 584, Vol. II, Part C, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Alkin, Marvin C., Doby, Winston, Freeman, Marie, & Lindheim, Elaine, 1992, Report on LAUSD Integration Programs: Ten Schools Program Special Studies, 1990-91 Publication No. 584, Vol. III, Part B, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Alkin, Marvin & Doby, Winston, 1990, Ten Schools Program Evaluation Reports Executive Summary 1988-1990, Publication No. 555, Part I, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Doby, Winston, 1990, Ten Schools Program Evaluation Reports Year Three District-Level Implementation Assessment July 1989-June 1990, Publication No. 555, Part II, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Lindheim, Elaine, 1990, Ten Schools Program Evaluation Reports: Interim Academic Achievement Report, Spring 1989, Publication No. 555, Part III, A and B, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Doby, Winston, Lindheim, Elaine, & Houck, David, 1990, Ten Schools Program Evaluation Reports Case Studies Update, 1988-89, Publication No. 555, Part IV, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Lindheim, Elaine, 1990, Ten Schools Program Evaluation Reports Status and Implementation, February 1989-January 1990, Publication No. 555, Part V, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Alkin, Marvin, Meade, Charlotte, Peterson, Alfreda, Turner, Alice, & Velarde Elena, 1992, Report on LAUSD Integration Programs Integration Programs: Ten Schools Program 1989-90 Case Studies Update, 1990-91 Publication No. 584, Vol. III, Part F, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Doby, Winston, 1989, Ten Schools Evaluation Reports A District-Level Implementation Assessment, Publication No. 540, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Lindheim, E, Alkin, M. & Doby, W., 1989, Ten Schools Evaluation Reports Executive Summary July 1987 – January 1989, Publication No. 540, Vol. I, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Doby, Winston, 1989, Ten Schools Evaluation Reports A District-Level Implementation Assessment, Publication No. 540, Vol. II, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Alkin, Marvin, Doby, Winston, & Lindheim, Elaine, 1989, Ten Schools Evaluation Reports Baseline Status and Implementation Report July, 1987 – January 1989, Publication No. 540, Vol. III, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Program Evaluation and Assessment Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Alkin, Marvin C., Doby, Winston, & Lindheim, Elaine, 1988, Ten Schools Program Language Development Instruction, Progress Report January 1988, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Research and Evaluation Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Alkin, Marvin C., Doby, Winston, & Lindheim, Elaine, 1988, Ten Schools Program Pre-service Staff Development, Progress Report January 1988, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Research and Evaluation Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

Doby, Winston, 1987, Ten Schools Program Planning Process, Publication No. 508, Program Evaluation and Research Branch (Research and Evaluation Branch), Los Angeles Unified School District

References

Technical Data Report; Stanford Achievement Test Series 9th Edition, Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement, San Antonio, 1997

1999 to 2000 Stanford 9 Matched Individual Students NCE Gains by District, School, and Grade Level (October 2000), Los Angeles Unified School District, Program Evaluation and Research Branch

Appendix A

Reference Guide No 10.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Office of the Superintendent

DISTRIBUTION: Elementary Schools
Middle Schools
Senior High Schools
Cluster Offices

ROUTING
Administrators

SUBJECT: REFERENCE GUIDE NO. 10 (Rev.)
FINGERTIP FACTS - STUDENT INTEGRATION SERVICES, 1996-97

DATE: January 31, 1997

DIVISION: Office of Student Integration Services

APPROVED: RUBEN ZACARIAS, Deputy Superintendent

For further information, please call Modesta Bassity, Coordinator, at (213) 625-6532.

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In 1970, Judge Alfred Gitelson, Los Angeles Superior Court, ruled that the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) operated segregated schools and rendered the initial order to integrate District schools. Upon appeal, the State Supreme Court agreed to hear the case and, on June 2, 1976, while disagreeing with Judge Gitelson's conclusion that the District had engaged in de jure (intentional) segregation, agreed with his ruling that the District was obligated under state law to take steps to alleviate the harms of segregation. The Court also ruled that desegregation is not strictly defined in terms of racial/ethnic percentages. The District was required by this ruling to take "reasonable and feasible" steps to alleviate the harms of segregation regardless of the cause and to demonstrate meaningful progress in the task.

On October 3, 1977, the District submitted to the Superior Court its student integration plan, Integrated Educational Excellence Through Choice, for implementation commencing September 1978. The plan provided for a mandatory desegregation component involving the pairing and clustering of schools and for the continuation of the voluntary programs which included the Magnet and Permits With Transportation (PWT) programs.

A. Predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian and Other Non-Anglo (PHBAO) School Programs

The plan, Integrated Educational Excellence Through Choice, did not include provisions for approximately 256,000 minority students who attended racially isolated schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Judge Paul Egly requested that the District identify methods to help ameliorate the Court identified four harms of racial isolation, which included low academic achievement, low self-esteem, lack of access to postsecondary opportunities, and interracial hostility and intolerance. Subsequently, the trial court added overcrowded conditions as the fifth harm. The District designated those schools as Racially Isolated Minority (RIM) schools whose populations were greater than 70% combined minority.

A needs assessment survey, conducted during the fall of 1978 with the participation of parents, teachers and principals of RIM schools, identified seven broad categories to which future programs should be addressed: improved teacher quality, improved curriculum, reduced enrollment, improved housing, increased parental participation, preschool education and year-round schools. In the spring of 1979, fifteen programs were developed to meet these needs and were subsequently implemented during the 1979-80 school year in 217 RIM schools. The number of RIM schools increased from 264 schools in 1980-81 to 298 schools in 1981-82.

In the ruling on Crawford v. LAUSD, on September 10, 1981, Judge Robert Lopez issued a final order which prohibited the use of the term "minority" in any manner, indicating that such students, in the aggregate, comprise the majority of the school population. Judge Lopez also maintained that the label "minority" was harmful to the self-esteem of many students whom the programs were intended to improve. As a consequence of this mandate, RIM schools were redesignated as Predominantly Hispanic, Black, Asian and Other Non-Anglo (PHBAO) schools. Since that time, the number of PHBAO schools has increased to 432 schools/newcomer centers in 1995-96. In 1989-90, twelve special education schools/centers received PHBAO status. The total number was increased to thirteen schools/centers in 1990-91.

The District continues to observe the terms and conditions of this final order of the Court. The Integration budget by category provided Class-Size Reduction, Transportation and Other Resources described as programs/activities below.

B. Magnet Program

The District's Magnet Program was established in 1976 with four schools to provide Los Angeles resident students with an educational program that focuses on subject specialties or on learning approaches that best fit the interests and needs of individual students.

During the mandatory phase of the District's desegregation plan, magnets, a voluntary option available to students, grew in number and enrollment each year. Except for gifted and highly gifted magnets, these programs are open to all District resident students who

are interested. The popularity of magnets is reflected in the substantial increase in applications each year. During 1995-96, 132 magnets operated in Grades K-12, serving over 42,000 students.

C. Permits With Transportation (PWT) Program

The PWT Program came into existence with the merger of the Voluntary Transportation Program and the Earthquake Displacement Program in 1972. The program started with 3,000 students. The purpose of the program is to provide integrated educational experiences for both PWT and receiving school students.

II. CURRENT INTEGRATION PROGRAMS

A. Voluntary Integration Programs

1. Continuing Voluntary Program (CVP)

Beginning in the 1995-96 school year, CVP has been combined with the Permits With Transportation Program. Historically, CVP provided the opportunity for students to continue to attend the school with which their resident school was paired or clustered during the now-concluded mandatory integration program. Receiving schools are allocated additional resources on a per-pupil basis.

2. Magnet Program

The Magnet Program is designed to provide opportunities for voluntary integrated education that is designed to fit students' interests or needs. The Magnet Program offers subject specialty classes, e.g., science, performing arts and business; or special teaching approaches, e.g., alternative and gifted. Students are selected randomly by computer, based on District- and Court-approved guidelines, ethnic balance and available space in each program.

3. Permits With Transportation (PWT) Program

The PWT Program provides transportation for students voluntarily attending schools other than their schools of residence. To address the Court-designated harms of segregation, the PWT Program is designed to provide opportunities for pupils of divergent cultures to know and understand one another, to help reduce racial isolation and relieve overcrowding by the effective use of available classroom space.

4. Cluster Resources

Cluster Resources are given to each of the District's twenty-seven (27) Clusters. The resources provide advisor time, advisory committee expense, clerical relief, community liaisons, contract services, mileage, and supplies. Community Liaisons comprise the Student Integration Advisory Council which was established under the 1979 Court Order of Judge Paul Egly. The council, composed of ethnic groups representing the District, advises the District on integration matters. The Community Liaisons train and work with the Community Representatives of PHBAO schools to open lines of communication in the District and the communities regarding desegregation.

B. PHBAO School Programs

1. Articulation Program

The Articulation Program in each school provides a means of improved communication among elementary, middle and senior high school levels by offering meetings for parents, teachers and counselors of the students' future schools. Meetings are arranged between elementary and middle schools or between middle and senior high schools, to explain the schools' programs, requirements and opportunities.

2. Bilingual Master Plan Differentials

This program provides for the payment of bilingual differentials and incentive stipends to qualified employees who are appropriately assigned to programs included in the Master Plan for the Education of Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students. These payments were instituted to enhance the quality of services provided to LEP students, to help the District recruit and retain qualified teachers for LEP students, and to serve as an incentive for employees to upgrade their qualifications and request or accept assignments utilizing their special qualifications in Master Plan programs. Employees in PHBAO schools and designated CAP-LEP Receiver schools (which receive sufficient LEP students from overcrowded PHBAO schools under the Capacity Adjustment Program) are eligible for the Integration-funded portion of these differential payments.

3. Counseling Support Program

The Counseling Support Program provides additional counseling services to all PHBAO senior high schools and to PHBAO elementary and middle schools selected from a ranked list of low-achieving schools. Counseling positions are

provided to the senior high schools, according to a norm chart, to reduce the counselor:student ratio. One counselor is provided for each of the selected 28 middle schools to assist with postsecondary planning and to increase the factors, behaviors and conditions that will help incoming students who are identified as "at risk" to succeed in middle schools.

One elementary school counselor is assigned to each of the 40 designated elementary schools, including schools in the Ten Schools Program, to provide counseling and guidance services that support the instructional program. A school psychologist is assigned to each of the ten schools for two and one-half days per week.

4. High Intensity Language Acquisition Program (also known as Master Plan Teacher Training Program) and Language Development Program for African American Students (also known as English Language Mastery Program)

   The Master Plan Teacher Training Program is designed to provide second-language skills for teachers assigned to instruct limited-English-proficient (LEP) students and support staff and administrators working with LEP students at PHBAO schools. The program also provides Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (CLAD)/Bilingual Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) bilingual methodology, culture/cultural diversity, and culture of emphasis, such as Latino and Korean culture. Participants sign a commitment to attend classes and to take the appropriate test(s) upon completion of the class(es).

   The English Language Mastery (ELM) Program also known as the Language Development Program for African American Students (LDPAAS), is designed to facilitate acquisition of the language of instruction (American English [AE] in students who are speakers of languages other than English. The program responds to two district documents The Children Can No Longer Wait: An Action Plan to End Low Achievement and Establish Educational Excellence (March, 1989), and Priorities for Education. A Design for Excellence (December 1986), which call for instruction appropriate to the specific language needs of students who speak non-mainstream languages, and for staff development on topics that "come directly from the needs of students [and] teachers," which "address both the content (what) and the process (how) of teaching." It provides comprehensive staff development and training to teachers, paraeducators, and parents on cultural diversity and instructional methodology issues and offers a strategies curriculum directed toward assuring LEP students' acquisition of literacy through access to the core curriculum.

5. Medical-Counseling, Organizing and Recruiting (Med-COR) Program

   The Med-COR Program provides opportunities for middle and high school students to become acquainted with the various health careers and the educational prerequisites. Students are also provided academic support in mathematics, English and science courses taken at PHBAO schools. This program is co-sponsored by the University of Southern California (USC) School of Medicine.

6. Parent Conferences Program

   PHBAO schools are required to provide two conferences between parents and teachers during the school year. The conferences allow parents to monitor the academic and social development of the students and to involve the parents in the educational processes. Individual parent conferences are conducted on the school sites, and written records of parent participation are kept by the schools.

   The first conference is scheduled during the first or second reporting period and either before or after subsequent to Back-to-School and Open House nights. The second conference is scheduled during the third or fourth reporting period and before the last four weeks of the school year.

7. Parents Involved in Community Action (PICA)

   PICA staff conducts inservice training sessions for parents that elicit and encourage full cooperation and support for all aspects of education of students in the Ten Schools Program.

8. Priority Staffing Program (PSP)

   The PSP develops, plans, and implements specific strategies to follow the Court Order's request for staffing of hard-to-staff schools. Such strategies include: conducting special recruitment activities, using school vacancy data to prioritize and expedite scheduling of interviews, providing an opportunity for principals to meet potential teachers, and immediate contracting and processing of selected teachers.

9. Project AHEAD (Accelerating Home Education and Development)

   Project AHEAD staff train parents of participating students (Grades K-5) in the Ten Schools Program to assist in their children's academic progress by providing a stimulating learning environment at home. Family educators use educational "appetizers" during home visits to teach parents how to increase their children's academic achievement.

10. School Readiness Language Development Program (SRLDP)

The SRLDP provides opportunities for pupils--including the child who is limited-English proficient (LEP) and needs primary-language instruction and the child who is in need of Standard English language instruction--who will be four years old by December 2 of the year of enrollment to develop oral language and readiness skills that enhance self-esteem and serve as a foundation for promoting academic achievement throughout the school experience. Parent education classes and parents' classroom participation are integral components of the School Readiness Language Development Program.

11. Step-To-College Program

The Step-To-College Program provides capable eleventh and twelfth grade students the opportunity to have university experiences by attending university classes at one of the California State University campuses while concurrently completing high school graduation requirements.

12. Student-To-Student (STS) Interaction Program

The STS Interaction Program is designed to address the harms of racial isolation, specifically interracial hostility and intolerance. Each Cluster will hold workshops that (1) provide training for students, staff, parents and community members in the area of human relations, (2) explore human relations concerns, obstacles and potential solutions and (3) allow each school to develop a human relations program. The Clusters will also identify one of the following three areas to study at a one day camp experience: school climate, cross-cultural understanding or conflict management/ resolution. The Office of Student Integration Services will provide assistance in the following areas: development of activities/curriculum, facilitation of workshop groups, development of agenda items as specified by each Cluster, operational assistance at the designated camp, assessment/evaluation and other technical assistance as requested by the Cluster.

13. Urban Classroom Teacher Program (UCTP)

The UCTP program is designed to recruit and retain teaching staff, to upgrade teaching quality and to provide additional services to students through additional teacher-student contact at identified educationally impacted schools. A salary differential is paid to identified certificated staff who agree in writing to provide additional services through increased student contacts for a specified amount of time.

C. Programs for Relief of Overcrowded Schools

Three programs are administered by the Office of School Utilization.

1. Capacity Adjustment Program (CAP)

When a school has reached its capacity and cannot accommodate additional students, new enrollees in Grades K-12 are offered transportation to an integrated school or, if space is available, to a closer PHBAO school. Receiving schools are allocated additional resources on a per-pupil basis.

2. Satellite Zone Program (SAT)

In this program, a portion of an overcrowded school's attendance area is assigned to an integrated school where space is available and students who reside in the satellite zone are transported to the receiver school. Receiving schools are allocated additional resources on a per-pupil basis.

3. Other Methods Which Address Overcrowding

Other methods which are used to address overcrowding include new construction, additions to existing schools, boundary changes, portable classrooms, publicizing voluntary options and year-round scheduling.

D. Class-Size Reduction

The reduced average class size has been a part of the integration program since 1978. The average class-size norm is based on the school program category. Currently, schools in the Desegregated/Receiver, PHBAO and Magnet program Group I and Group II categories receive lowered norms supported by integration monies. These lowered class-size averages are applicable to all classes at magnets, Grades 1-6 at elementary schools and academic classes in Grades 6-10 at secondary schools.

E. Ten Schools Program (TSP)

In July 1987, after an extensive planning process, the Ten Schools Program was implemented. The TSP is a research-based instructional and organizational effort to restructure ten schools in a way that clearly demonstrates that all students achieve their highest potential when the conditions for learning are at an optimum. The ten lowest achieving schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District with a predominant African American student population were selected to participate in the Ten Schools

Program. Currently, the TSP pupil population is predominantly African American and Hispanic.

The mission of the TSP is to provide an instructional program and an organizational design that is language instruction intensive to reverse the pattern of poor academic achievement of African American and other students in PHBAO schools. This mission will be accomplished through on-going coordinated relevant staff development supported by a home-school partnership.

###